

REMARKS

Summary

Applicant has rewritten Claim 1 and cancelled Claim 3. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendment. Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are pending after entry of this amendment.

Objection to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing the front end centers and the unequal number of turns of adjacent coils. Applicant has enclosed corrected versions of Figs. 2-4 with corrections marked in red, as well as the formal versions. Applicant requests that the Examiner approve the corrections. Applicant notes that corrected Fig. 4 now illustrates front end centers 33g through 38g, which were also referred to as the circumferential central positions 33g through 38g. However, Fig. 3 illustrates that the distance between turns in adjacent coils is (at least approximately) the same while the length of the adjacent coils are different. Since the number of turns is proportional to the length of the coil divided by the distance between turns, Applicant respectfully submits that coils 33a to 38a shown in Fig. 3 already illustrate that the adjacent coils contain an unequal number of turns. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that no further alteration of Fig. 3 is necessary.

Rejection of Claims

In the Office Action, Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner stated that the term "front end centers" is indefinite because the term is not clearly defined in the specification. Although Applicant submits each term found in the claims does not specifically have to be defined in the specification, so long as one of skill in the art would understand to what the term was referring, and, in addition, the specification already described circumferential central positions 33g through 38g (i.e. front end centers), Applicant has rewritten the elements of Claim 3 as well as the specification to clarify any existing ambiguity. Applicant submits that Claim 1, which now contains the elements of Claim 3, overcomes the rejection.


In the Office Action, Claims 1-2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Andrey (U.S. Patent 5,723,931), Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrey in view of Nashiki (U.S. Patent 6,285,104), and Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrey in view of Kimura (U.S. Patent 6,265,800).

The Examiner indicated that Claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in an independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant has rewritten Claim 1 to incorporate the elements of Claim 3 and submits that Claim 1 overcomes the Examiner's rejection and thus pending Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks an early allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.
Registration No. 46,193
Agent for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200







FIG. 3

